

Notice of Allowability

Application No.

10/691,100

Examiner

Raymond J. Bayerl

Applicant(s)

BERSTIS, VIKTORS

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to application as filed/amended, 22 October 2003.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 12 - 14, 23 - 38, all other claims canceled.
3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
 5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
 - (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date _____
4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material

5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6. ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____
7. ☒ Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. ☐ Other _____

RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173

2 April 2007

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

2. The application has been amended as follows:

In the Specification:

Page 1, line 1—the phrase “currently pending” has been replaced by “now US Patent no. 6,720,981 B1”.

This amendment to the specification updated the reference back to the parent of the present divisional application.

3. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The Examiner has carefully considered each of applicant's 3 independent claims 12, 27, 33, in which a “browser displaying a web page” responds to “receiving a web object belonging to a web page” by “automatically zooming out” to show “a full page view of the entire web page”, and then “zooming in to said current view” where “less than a full page view” is seen (claim 12 quoted as exemplary). After such consideration and a search of the relevant prior art, the Examiner deems the claims to be patentable over the prior art now made of record, whether alone or in combination.

As applicant notes in the specification, the reference Berstis et al. (US #5,896,132), while allowing the user to perceive the presence of additional content beyond the zoomed in view that only holds a portion of the overall page, does not enter

into the useful details of a zoom-out upon item addition followed at completion by a zoom-in.

The scaling adaptation of web pages as a general matter **was** known in the art, as in Kanevsky (US #6,300,947 B1) and White et al. (US #2002/0,021,308 A1), only the scaling taught in these references is for the purpose of fitting the content to a particular kind of display screen, and not to assist the user in knowing about overall web page size. A similar line of reasoning applies to Qureshi et al. (US #6,456,305 B1), where the sizing of web page components is simply to adapt to a particular browser window, and not responsive to objects arriving that are to be added to the web page as per the present claims.


There are of course examples of scaled web pages that **are** intended to provide a view as to overall page context, as is seen in Bates et al. (US #6,585,776 B1), where document content is depicted in such a way as to facilitate more ready access within a hierarchy, and Fortin et al. (US #2002/0,023,110 A1), in which a diagram may be seen at a variety of zoom levels, as the user sees fit in browsing a structure of nodes. However, the scaling in these references also fails to occur in response to arriving items as they are added to the web page, on an automatic basis, followed by a reversion to a closer-viewing scale when the arrival is completed.

Finally worthy of mention is Pasquali (US #6,272,493 B1), in which a display contains an overall context of content-containing window objects, as does the complete document of the present claims, with a goal to facilitate better user access to the content. However, there is no apparent "zooming out" or "zooming in" in the reference,

Art Unit: 2173

except to the extent that the user might happen to have a set of the well-known positive/negative "magnifying glass" buttons for a screen view, in which case it is user decision, and not web-page item arrival, that governs the scaling..

4. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."
5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Raymond J. Bayerl, whose telephone number is (571) 272-4045. The Examiner can normally be reached on M – Th from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM ET.
6. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached at 571-272-4063. All patent application related correspondence transmitted by FAX **must be directed** to the central FAX number (571) 273-8300.
7. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application of proceeding should be directed to the receptionist, whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.


RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173

2 April 2007